

ton, the Boston Yacht Club, and the Bald Park Colony Club of Melvin Village, N.H.

This record of service to church, State, and business organizations will stand, without a doubt, as his most enduring memorial.

Both myself, and my wife Corrine extend all our sympathies to his bereaved wife Helen and his mother, sister, and sons. May his many accomplishments comfort them in this time of loss.

PRESIDENTIAL AMBITION

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the Record the following illuminating article from the November 30, 1973, edition of the New Times magazine. This article is written by John D. Lofton about one of our colleagues, JOHN ASHBROOK, and I insert it for the interest of those who read the RECORD:

PRESIDENTIAL AMBITION

(By John D. Lofton Jr.)

At the 1968 Republican Convention, conservative Congressman John M. Ashbrook was one of two dissenters who rejected Governor John Rhodes' demand that the Ohio delegation unanimously support the Presidential ambitions of Nelson Rockefeller. Ashbrook did so in order to vote for Richard Nixon. In 1972, Ashbrook himself ran for President in the Republican primaries. He did so because he felt Richard Nixon had broken his 1968 campaign promises, had reversed himself on welfare, national defense, federal spending, China and trade with Communist countries.

Now, in November of 1973 on a cold, gloomy, rainy morning, the former Young Republican National Chairman and co-founder of the American Conservative Union sits in his Washington, D.C. office and says that if President Nixon were to ask him what he would tell the President he ought to call it quits. "I don't think there is any way he can regain his credibility," Ashbrook says. "I suppose if he were to ask me personally, I would say he ought to resign. I have not urged this publicly because of the chorus of jackals that I see throughout the

country urging impeachment and resignation."

In politics, Ashbrook goes on, "You don't mind what the opposition says, you don't mind if they call you an S.O.B., you don't mind if they say various things. But if they start laughing at you or think you're crazy or a joke, at that point you're in trouble and never regain your credibility." Ashbrook believes the President has now reached that point.

"The most loyal, knee-jerk Republican in the Congress at this point is reluctant to defend the President," Ashbrook says. "Some of his best friends and most loyal supporters feel as if they've been led down the garden path. For example, we were told categorically he would not give up the tapes and he has given them up. Some of the Republican leaders, my friends in the House, were told by the White House to go out and say things about Ohio Senator William Saxbe last December when Saxbe said the President had taken leave of his senses in resuming the bombing of North Vietnam. Now, the President appoints Saxbe Attorney General.

"So, what is happening is just a continual litany of mistakes by the President. And when I say this I'm not speaking for the 200 million people in the country, but for his circle of friends, his supporters, and the people that carry the burdens of his Presidency, his programs and those trying to sell them to the public. There is no enthusiasm now. He can't be sold in the Congress or on the hustings back home."

Ashbrook is carefully choosing his words. His voice is calm and measured as he says that privately many of his conservative colleagues in the House believe the President has taken leave of his senses. "You take October, for example. We used to sit around and say not much more can happen. Well, as it turned out, we were wrong. We kept saying that the other shoe had to drop soon. But we now find out the President is a centipede. There's a shoe a week. He's dropped more shoes than he has feet."

Ashbrook is 45 years old and serving his sixth term in the House. And for the first time, he says, he is getting mail critical of the President from Republicans back home. "I know my constituency well. I recognize when the League of Women Voters and the college professors and their wives write on the bombing of Hanoi and so forth. My mail is not coming from them now. It's coming from Republicans. This is the first time I've gotten mail like this, mail from Republican committeemen and finance people. I think it's just a sense of frustration that enough is enough is enough and I've had enough of enough. They are fed up with the President, fed up and tired of what they call 'this whole mess.'"

On the subject of relations between the White House and the Republican party, Ashbrook says the greatest joke in Congressional cloak rooms is the line put out by the White House three or four months ago that things would be better with Haldeman and Ehrlichman gone, and former Representative Melvin Laird and Bryce Harlow replacing them.

"It's no more open now than it ever was for Congressional Republicans," Ashbrook says. "There's probably less political input than there ever was, there are probably more mistakes made than ever before."

"If, during the very critical years, 1969 to 1972, three or four conservative leaders had joined me in criticizing the President's isolation, his palace guards—Ehrlichman and Haldeman—I think we'd be in a little better position now. Of course, the Republican party showed no leadership and went along with the President regardless of the price."

John Ashbrook does not think President Nixon could resign until Gerald Ford is confirmed as Vice President. When asked what kind of President he thinks Ford would make, Ashbrook replies, simply: "A better one."

THOMAS M. PELLY

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1973

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, sadness at the loss of one of our colleagues is heightened when the Member was a man of the integrity and personableness of Thomas M. Pelly.

Although I never had the opportunity to serve in committee with Tom Pelly, I had gotten to know him in countless discussions and conversations in the House.

To me he was a man you could trust, a man who commanded esteem, a man ready to be a friend.

The high respect he held in this Chamber was well deserved. He formed his views carefully and argued for them ably and effectively. He was always square with his colleagues.

Service and country were foremost on his list of priorities. To me Tom Pelly was a patriot of the first order, and I am sorry to see this Nation lose him.

SENATE—Sunday, December 2, 1973

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. FRANK E. MOSS, a Senator from the State of Utah.

PRAYER

The Honorable WALLACE F. BENNETT, a Senator from the State of Utah, offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, as we come together on this unusual and historic occasion, we ask Thy forgiveness for intruding our affairs into what should be a day devoted to Thy praise and service.

But, in the spirit of the day, we ask that Thou wilt touch our minds and hearts so that we will approach the responsibilities we must carry out with an

appreciation of their spiritual values, with a realization of the effect that they may have upon our country, and with more concern for our country's welfare than our own.

We ask this in the name of Thy Son, Jesus Christ. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., December 2, 1973.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. FRANK E. MOSS, a Senator from the State of Utah, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MOSS thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of November 27, 1973, Mr. JACK-

son, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, reported favorably, with amendments, on December 1, 1973, the bill (S. 1283) to establish a national program for research, development, and demonstration in fuels and energy and for the coordination and financial supplementation of Federal energy research and development; to establish development corporations to demonstrate technologies for shale oil development, coal gasification development, advanced power cycle development, geothermal steam development, and coal liquefaction development; to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to make mineral resources of the public lands available for said development corporations; and for other purposes, and submitted a report (No. 93-589) thereon, which was printed.

ORDER FOR PRINTING TODAY'S PRAYER

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, in this historic session, I ask unanimous consent that the prayer offered in the Senate Chamber this morning by the distinguished Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT) be printed on parchment for availability for circulation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, December 1, 1973, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DIVISION OF TIME ON CONSIDERATION OF CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time under the cloture period be divided equally between the Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), the manager of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUPPORT GROWS FOR PUBLIC FINANCING OF CAMPAIGNS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article published in the National Observer for the week ending December 8, 1973, entitled "Paying for Politics—Support Grows for Public Financing," written by Mark R. Arnold, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the National Observer, December 1973]

PAYING FOR POLITICS—SUPPORT GROWS FOR PUBLIC FINANCING

(By Mark R. Arnold)

You may be paying for Nelson Rockefeller's bid for the Presidency in 1976. And George Wallace's, and Charles Percy's, and Shirley Chisholm's.

That's what public financing of Presiden-

tial campaigns means in its simplest terms. It also means—and this accounts for the frantic efforts in the Senate last week to enact public campaign-financing legislation—a giant step toward eliminating the influence of large campaign contributors on the political process.

Senate proponents regard public campaign financing as the only way to remove the political stains splattered by the Watergate affair on the mantle of all Federal officeholders. "Beyond any doubt," Massachusetts' Edward M. Kennedy argued to his colleagues, "the year-long revelations of Watergate demonstrate the insidious influence of private money in American politics. Most of the serious problems facing this country have their roots in the way we finance campaigns for high office."

Kennedy is one of nine senators from both parties who last week successfully rammed through the Senate a sweeping reform bill providing for public financing of Presidential and congressional campaigns, though not congressional primaries. They offered their measure as an amendment to a bill urgently sought by the White House—a bill to raise the Federal debt limit—and thus sought to make campaign reform veto-proof.

THREAT IN SAFE DISTRICTS

The strategy initially ran into trouble. The House balked at bypassing its own committee procedures to accommodate what its leaders consider the Senate's strong-arm pressure tactics. House members were particularly critical of the section covering House campaigns, which would guarantee that even members from politically safe districts would face well-financed opposition in future elections.

So Senate backers, after reaching agreement with House leaders on how much of the plan would be acceptable to them, stripped down the plan. They knocked out everything but the Presidential provisions, which make partial public financing of Presidential campaigns mandatory, beginning in 1976.

Opponents warned that President Nixon might veto the bill. The President wants Congress to set up a commission to study political fund raising. But the supporters of reform pressed on.

Two votes show the changing congressional sentiment toward public financing. On July 26 the Senate defeated public financing, 53 to 38. Last week it approved a similar proposal, 52 to 40.

WATERGATE TESTIMONY

The difference between the votes can largely be attributed to the recent testimony of a parade of corporation executives before the Senate Watergate committee. Seven companies and their executives have been found guilty of violating laws outlawing corporate contributions to political campaigns. Others are still being investigated.

The classic pattern of favor-seeking was described by Machiavelli in *The Prince*, in 1532, this way: "Those who wish to win favor with the prince offer him the things they most value and in which they see that he will take most pleasure."

But in the pattern outlined to the Watergate committee, the offers flowed in the opposite direction, and could even be described as threats.

Former American Airlines Chairman George A. Spater, the first businessman to disclose an illegal contribution, told a typical story. He was approached in July 1972 by Herbert Kalmbach, President Nixon's personal attorney, who also is counsel to United Air Lines, a major competitor of American.

The call came at a time when American was seeking Federal approval to merge with Western Airlines. Though there was apparently no discussion of the merger, Kalmbach suggested that a \$100,000 contribution

from Spater would put him in a "special class" of contributors, the executive testified. The corporation eventually produced \$56,000 in illegal funds for the Nixon reelection campaign. "I was motivated by a host of fears" that American might be "put at a competitive disadvantage" if it didn't oblige the fund raisers, Spater said. (The merger was subsequently disapproved nonetheless.)

The kind of contributions described by the executives is already illegal. But the Senate legislation would make it more unlikely to be solicited and easier to detect. It would, for example, put a \$3,000 ceiling on individual contributions to any Presidential candidate in the primaries. In addition, the legislation would provide:

Presidential primaries: Candidates collecting \$100,000 in contributions of \$100 or less would become eligible for matching Federal payments. Each contribution of \$100 or less by an individual would be matched equally from a special campaign fund created by taxpayer contributions as outlined below. There would be a \$15 million limit on each candidate's total spending in the primaries (half public, half private). The \$100,000 requirement is aimed at screening out "frivolous" candidates.

Presidential elections: Beginning in 1976, elections would be financed by a special fund fed by taxpayers who elect to check off \$1 on their income-tax returns for political purposes (\$2 on a joint return). Each major party candidate would be allowed to spend up to \$21 million for his campaign.

If not enough taxpayers contribute to the fund, each candidate could raise the difference between his share of the fund and his \$21 million entitlement by soliciting private contributions, but no contribution could exceed \$3,000. Or Congress could appropriate the difference.

Public financing might prompt new abuses. And, as has been noted in this space before [The National Observer, Oct. 13, 1973], it raises a serious Constitutional question: Isn't a limit on contributions an abridgment of free speech and association?

But whatever the scheme's shortcomings, it could remove the influence of large contributions on elections. And that, in the atmosphere of a Watergate-weary Washington, is enough to have breathed new life into an old idea.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President—

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who yields time?

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate completes its business today, it come in tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TEMPORARY INCREASE IN PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order the Chair now lays before the Senate the pending business which the clerk will state.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

H.R. 11104 to provide for a temporary increase of \$10.7 billion in the public debt limit and to extend the period to which this temporary debt limit applies to June 30, 1974.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to insist on the Senate amendments to H.R. 11104 and request a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time on the cloture motion which will become eligible for consideration tomorrow, and which was filed yesterday, begin at the hour of 1 p.m.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield for a moment?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN. Is he going to press the cloture motion today?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; this is for tomorrow.

Mr. ALLEN. You anticipate it is going to fail today?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; just in case. Just insurance. [Laughter.]

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President—

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Mr. President, we are all so happy and so pleased and delighted to be here today that I do not think I will say anything to add to the joy involved in this conversational exchange.

Let us leave that to those who wished to be present today. I speak as one who did not.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I am glad to see that the minority leader is wearing the badge of merit over his heart today.

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. I wear it over my heart in recollection of my sins and hope for a better life from now on. [Laughter.]

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Time is now under control—

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time will be equally divided between the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. Long) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, a quorum has not been established. That would come first.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. The establishment of a quorum is not required at this point.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the absence of a quorum until the end of the hour—who yields time? Who yields time?

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President—Mr. President—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator may not be recognized until time is yielded to him.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a member of the Judiciary staff be present during this debate—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who yields time?

Mr. ALLEN. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Packet of the Judiciary staff be allowed the privilege of the floor during this debate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Alabama is recognized. How much time does the Senator yield to himself?

Mr. ALLEN. I yield myself 6 minutes.

The issue presented to the Senate today is whether there shall be placed above the fiscal integrity of the U.S. Government a demand for a Federal hand-out to some score or more Presidential hopefuls of up to \$7½ million. Included in that number are some 8 or 10 U.S. Senators and, in addition, some of the wealthiest men in the United States. It seems to the Senator from Alabama that we would have to look mighty far to find a group of people to whom the Federal Government does not give financial assistance if we are to provide a Federal handout in the form of a Federal subsidy for candidates for the Presidency, for Presidential hopefuls who seek the Presidential nomination of their respective parties. This is an effort on the part of those who would put such a handout ahead of the fiscal integrity of the United States.

What would it do? It would undercut the Watergate Committee. That committee was set up to rectify abuses resulting from campaign issues. Unless I miss my guess, there are five members of the Watergate Committee who do not favor this proposal.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLEN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator referred to this as a handout. Does not the Senator mean "reach-in"?

Mr. ALLEN. "Reach in" and take out. Yes, "reach in." They reach in and take out of the taxpayers' pockets. The Senator is absolutely correct.

This measure, which has had all of 30 amendments, according to the distinguished chairman of the committee, has had 3 minutes of consideration. Who knows what it says? There is not a copy on the desk of any Senator. So far as this Senator is concerned, he has not received a copy.

It undercuts the Watergate Committee. It does not wait for that committee to make its recommendation. That committee does not like it. Five of the seven members do not like this provision.

What else does it do? It undercuts the committee system. This bill has not had any consideration before a committee. It undercuts the committee system. It undercuts the U.S. Senate itself, because on July 30, we passed in the Senate, by a vote of 88 to 8, S. 372, that provides for strict regulation of campaign receipts, expenditures, and disclosures. That bill is now in the House of Representatives.

But far more than that, far more than

the instant case, is the precedent we are going to be setting, if a little group of men in the Senate, so-called leaders, can get together and present a half-baked proposal such as this is to the Senate, get a vote on it, add it to a House bill, have the House give it no consideration until the final package is presented to it, and then send it to the President in a veto-proof condition because it is added to a "must" bill.

Mr. President, if we are going to allow that precedent, if we are going to allow a little group of so-called leaders in the Senate, to tack a half-baked concoction such as this, which nobody knows the details of, to a must bill, we are going to establish a precedent—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The 6 minutes of the Senator have expired.

Mr. ALLEN. I yield myself an additional 2 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. ALLEN. If we are going to allow a small group of people to rewrite the basic and fundamental principles upon which our governmental processes are based, without ever sending such a measure to a committee, without it ever having 1 day of hearing, this will be the practice as often as this bill comes up, and it has come up every 5 or 6 months, because Congress, in its wisdom, extends this limit for only 5 or 6 months at a time.

So now is the time to call a halt to it. If those who favor this raid on the Treasury place that ahead and above and beyond the fiscal integrity of the United States, so be it.

Mr. President, I have presented twice in the Senate a motion that would resolve this whole matter and send this bill to the President; and I hope that after the cloture motion is voted on, we will act on that, and that we will not be prevented from acting on it by a filibuster or parliamentary tactics, because that motion is still pending before the Senate. As soon as the cloture motion is disposed of, we will move to the motion to recede and vote on a bill which will be passed and go to the President. He is in Washington for this weekend, and he can sign the measure.

So, Mr. President, a great issue is presented here—whether we are going to legislate by just a few fellows getting together and saying, "We wish to compromise, and we can handle those fellows in the House. They are just a bunch of sacks of potatoes," they say—not those I know—"and we can pass that over there. All we have to do is agree to it in the Senate."

We are not going to agree to it today in the Senate, in the judgment of the Senator from Alabama, and I hope we will pass the debt limit bill.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who yields time?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am afraid that the distinguished Senator from Alabama doth protest too much.

He talks about undercutting the Watergate Committee. As a matter of fact, it was the Watergate Committee which helped to generate the question of contributions by corporations and others in Presidential campaigns.

In my opinion—and I may be wrong—I have an idea that the distinguished Senator from Alabama would not even vote for a Presidential proposal of this nature, even if it were proposed by the Watergate Committee.

He says, also, that we are attempting to undercut the committee system. The distinguished Senator from Alabama knows better than that. He knows that the committees are the servants of the Senate as a whole, and the Senate as a whole is now and has been and will be, if need be, considering this measure. After all, when we think of committees, we think of them as the creatures and the servants of the Senate. They are nothing special. They are subordinate to this body. That is the way it is, and that is the way it will be, because no committee is going to tell the Senate how the Senate as a whole is going to vote.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to yield.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG. I yield 2 additional minutes.

As a practical matter, I ask the Senator, is it not the Committee on Finance that would have jurisdiction of this matter, not the Watergate Committee?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Of course.

Mr. LONG. The fact is that the Committee on Finance has considered this type of matter several times before, and we in the committee had the proposal before us. If one looks at the rollcall votes, he will see that the committee would be closely divided on this matter, even more closely divided than the Senate itself.

It would be appropriate to say—as the committee did—that no matter what advice we may give the Senate about this matter, the Senate is still going to reach its own conclusions. Therefore, we reported the debt limit bill, reserving the right to every Senator on that committee—as we would expect every Senator who has heard this issue debated time and time again for weeks and months in the Senate—to take a position on this issue.

Basically, I am persuaded that it is the issue we are talking about, not the precise details of how it is to be done. It is a question of whether one wants to remove from this Government the power of private money to dictate the decisions rather than the consciences of private people. It is an issue that is far bigger, in my judgment, than the Finance Committee, the Watergate Committee, or any others. It was here with us, and may I say that the Senate had taken a position on it, long before we had ever heard of the Watergate Committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct. All the Watergate Committee can do is to recommend legislation; and if legislation is recommended in this area, it would, of course, go to the Fi-

nance Committee. The Finance Committee has held hearings on this proposal. The Senate has discussed it on 3, 4, or 5 different days that I can recall.

I do not think that this is a "half-baked" proposal, as the distinguished Senator from Alabama seems to indicate; nor do I think that the leaders—the Democratic leaders, that is—when they met, took onto themselves extraordinary prerogatives because we said that we would try to get the Senate and the House to agree to a proposal of this nature.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The 4 minutes of the Senator have expired.

Mr. LONG. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), who I thought had signed the cloture motion yesterday, be included in yesterday's cloture motion.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. Who yields time?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 4 minutes?

Mr. LONG. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the last time the Senate met in extraordinary Sunday session was more than 100 years ago, on the eve of the Civil War and the inauguration of Abraham Lincoln, the President who saved the Union.

It is entirely appropriate, therefore, that we meet in extraordinary Sunday session this morning on what we hope is the eve of the most important action Congress can take to save the Union from Watergate and preserve the political system of the Nation.

Last week, a strong bipartisan majority of the Senate enacted far-reaching legislation to establish public financing of all elections for Federal office—President, House and Senate. Since that action, we have received strong indications that the House of Representatives is prepared to accept at least two major parts of that legislation now—the prohibition on private financing in the general election for President, so that all candidates will be required to use the public financing option now available; and the matching grant provisions for partial public financing of Presidential primaries.

Although the third major provision of the amendment passed by the Senate last Tuesday—public financing for Senate and House elections—may not be enacted now, it is still of great significance that the full Senate is so squarely on record in support of this provision. I believe its enactment will come swiftly, as soon as the House of Representatives has had the opportunity to consider more fully the application of public financing to its own elections.

But Congress is ready now, on the Debt Ceiling Act, to take a giant step toward restoring the shattered confidence of the people in the integrity of their Government. Those who seek today to frustrate the will of the majority of the Senate by

maintaining this unconscionable filibuster are also frustrating a majority of the House of Representatives and a majority of the American people and they cannot be allowed to prevail.

If Watergate means anything, it means that the time has come to end the corrosive power of private money in public life. The corruption of the 1972 election demonstrates beyond any doubt that our campaign financing laws are hopelessly inadequate to stem the tide of abuse that flows from the power of giant political contributors and those who seek their contributions.

If we seize the moment we now have, we can shut off forever the underground flow of cash in political campaigns. We can ring down the curtain on the role of big campaign contributors. For too long, they have profaned the proud profession of politics. The time has come to end the corruption and the appearance of corruption that always travel in their wake.

Public financing is the best single answer Congress can provide to the evils symbolized by Watergate. At a single stroke, by enacting the bill before us, we can take the Presidential election off the auction block, and give it back to the American people.

I hope this filibuster marks the last stand of those who would ignore the lesson of Watergate and preserve the status quo. There is no wiser investment the hard-pressed and long-suffering American taxpayer can make than to spend his tax dollars on public financing of elections, and I hope that Congress will vote today to let this measure pass.

Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Louisiana a very brief question. He has served in the Senate for, I believe, 24 years.

Mr. LONG. Twenty-five years.

Mr. KENNEDY. Twenty-five years. The Senator from Louisiana has seen filibusters come and go. I would be interested in his view as to whether this type filibuster could really take place and continue without the support and encouragement, or at least the acquiescence, of the White House.

Does the Senator, who is the manager of the bill and who has been one of the real pioneers in campaign reform, think we should have a statement from the President of the United States on the issue that has brought the Senate to an extraordinary session at this time? The President has stated in the past that he is for campaign reform legislation. The former Vice President said he believes in public financing. We have had a clear expression by the Senate. A strong majority of the Senate is on record in favor of this legislation. Why is the President silent?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for 1 additional minute?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. A strong majority of the Members of this body has voted in support of this legislation, and I believe that a majority of the House would do so as well.

Does the Senator agree with me that it

would be appropriate for the American people, as the Senate meets in this deadlock situation, to receive some clear expression from the President on this issue, which has brought us to this extraordinary session?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I am convinced that a successful filibuster cannot be sustained against this proposal which, from the point of view of those of us who favor it, is to remove the influence of big money from its potential of dominating decisions of this Government. In my judgment a filibuster cannot be sustained if the man who sits in the White House did not want that type filibuster to succeed. If he wanted it to succeed, my guess is it would have a fairly good chance of continuing, even successfully; but if he does not want it to be sustained, it seems to me he could make his views clear and there would not be 34 votes in this body to support the filibuster.

It is obvious where the votes are. The Senate voted to propose this measure. This measure has gone to the House before, and it went there without a filibuster. So it is fairly clear that we would not have a filibuster on our hands if it were not for the fact that there are those in this body as well as in the House who feel that the House is willing to agree to something, and what they are willing to agree to are those items mentioned by the Senator from Massachusetts: one, a prohibition on accepting private contributions on the part of one who is a candidate for President of one of the two major parties; and, two, a proposal that we would help to relieve the pressure of accepting financial contributions, large ones, at least, by those who are candidates for the office of President in the nomination process of the two major parties.

So we have here a proposal that the majority of us, and I believe a majority in both Houses, believe would have a cleansing effect and tend to remove this Government from the power of money to corrupt it, or at least lessen that power in a very major way. It has to do with one's philosophy of government. It goes back to the quarrel between Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton about whether the few should rule or whether the many should rule in this land. It is fundamental to all of us. Frankly, although some may give it little credit, there is something to be said for the Alexander Hamilton side of the argument, and that philosophy is being expressed by those who do not want this to go to the President. Those who have the majority should be in a position to lay their legislative proposal on the President's desk. If he still feels determined about this matter, as he was a year or two ago, we would not expect him to veto it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG. I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

It may be that the President actually would want to follow through with what he said when he made a rather contrite statement before the American people on television, urging Congress to prepare

some measure to see that this type scandal which is plaguing his administration will never happen.

It seems to me that he would want to go along today with those who have better credentials in this area of maintaining a system above and beyond the power of money or any improper forces to corrupt. He should be willing to accept the judgment of others who have better credentials than he in this area. It seems to me he might be willing to sign a measure passed by a majority of this Congress who think this will have a pronounced cleansing effect on our Government. If not, we would have to consider whether we have the votes to override a veto, and if we do not, we will have to yield eventually to the President on this matter. But we should have a chance to find out. Those supporting a filibuster today should be willing to permit the Senate to take its proposal to the President so that he can either agree with those who are conducting the filibuster or those who have been among his strongest supporters in the past.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I think it is appropriate that we meet this morning for the first time in 112 years on a Sabbath morning because I believe what we have before us truly is the Lord's work. If it was necessary once to force the moneychangers out of the temple, it is equally obvious we must chase those who would compromise and corrupt politics and the American political system out of the system this morning and seek to do so by adopting cloture and going on to adopt the underlying measure.

Mr. President, let us be clear about what is going on here today.

An administration which has done more than any other in the history of this Nation to illustrate the defects in our present system of financing political campaigns apparently would prefer to have American Government grind to a halt rather than clean it up.

The Halls of the Senate are haunted by White House lobbyists attempting to kill this reform of Presidential campaigns. And high White House officials are twisting the arms of Members of Congress with the threat that the debt limit bill will be vetoed if our reforms are attached.

It is a final irony that this administration—which is above all responsible for dramatizing the corrupting influence of massive campaign contributions on our political life—has now mustered such a fierce lobbying effort to preserve the very system which has led to their corruption and possible downfall. In their desperation, they seem bent on preserving the very system that has nearly destroyed them.

This is a tawdry spectacle to place before the American people in the year of Watergate. And if the administration achieves the one-third minority needed to frustrate the will of the Senate and the people, it will be a national tragedy.

The American people are tired of clever and disingenuous maneuvering by politicians.

They are fed up with the filth and corruption of our present system of financing political campaigns.

They want an end to the cynical business of putting American Government up for sale to the highest bidder.

They want an end to the "Buy America" system of financing campaigns.

By an overwhelming majority of 59 to 36 the Senate of the United States—Democrats and Republicans alike—voted this week to make a start on ending this system for good, through combined public and private financing in all campaigns for Federal office—for the Presidency, the House, and the Senate.

Now we are given to understand by the leadership of the House of Representatives that the House is willing to join with us to provide a comprehensive system of public financing for at least Presidential elections.

And this is the argument today. The question is whether we will join with the House to reform Presidential campaign financing, or allow this critical reform to founder on the rocks of parliamentary maneuvering.

The provisions which the House is willing to accept are essentially those introduced by Senator SCHWEIKER and myself last July.

And they were overwhelmingly approved by the Senate in the comprehensive amendment adopted last week under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

Under this plan:

Each candidate in the Presidential primaries would be entitled to matching payments of public funds for the first \$100 received from each individual contributor, but candidates must first accumulate \$100,000 in contributions of \$100 or less.

Treasury matching payments in the primary period would be limited to \$7 million per candidate, and no candidate could spend more than \$15 million overall in the primaries.

In Presidential general elections, public financing through the voluntary dollar checkoff is made mandatory instead of permitting candidates to forgo public funds and use all private money, as the present law allows. This effectively limits each candidate to spending no more than \$21 million in the general election.

Now, the administration, supported by a minority of Senators, is trying to destroy our chance to achieve this fundamental reform of Presidential campaign financing.

The plan for public financing of Presidential campaigns is, we are told, "a raid on the Federal Treasury for the politicians of the country."

This is the kind of distorted rhetoric we have already heard far too often in this year of Watergate.

For under the proposal the success of a candidate in securing financial support, at the primary level, will be proportional to his or her ability to first secure broad-based support from thousands of small and moderate contributors.

The success of the proposal for both primary and general elections depends on the willingness of millions of Americans to check off dollars on their tax forms.

And our public financing proposals will cost less than one one-hundredth of 1 percent of the Federal budget.

For this small price, we can free the American Presidency from the stench and corruption of our present system of campaign financing. It is the best investment the taxpayers of this country could possibly make.

Let us look for a moment at some of the costs of our present system of financing campaigns:

In 1970, President Nixon rejected his Cabinet's recommendation to abolish oil import quotas, which were costing the American consumer \$5 billion a year in higher oil prices, and forcing us to consume our own badly needed reserves. The oil industry, which strongly favored retention of the quotas, gave at least \$500,000 to President Nixon's 1968 campaign.

The oil industry receives over \$2 billion a year in special tax subsidies which go virtually unchallenged, and additional billions in monopoly profits which go untouched by price controls and antitrust laws.

A congressional study a year or two ago found that the total cost of all Federal subsidies—cash payments, tax subsidies, and other special benefits—comes to over \$60 billion a year. Many of these subsidies go to industries and special interests that contribute large amounts to political campaigns.

Many of these provisions serve legitimate purposes. But they are surrounded with an air of special advantage that tinges even the most worthwhile with suspicion. And it is clear that other equally worthy causes—supported by ordinary voters—cannot begin to command the interest and sympathy from our Government that is given to the financially powerful.

But it is not just these direct costs that are harmful. What is far more damaging is the harm that is done by our present system to the trust and confidence American citizens must have in their Government.

The erosion of this trust in recent years is reflected in public opinion polls. A recent Gallup poll showed that only 25 percent of the American people are satisfied with the way this Nation is being governed—a drop of 11 percentage points in just 2 years.

It is not hard to understand why this has happened. What can we expect when people hear about things like—

Financier Robert Vesco giving \$200,000 to the Nixon campaign and then getting an appointment 2 hours later with the head of the SEC to discuss his financial problems.

Top Nixon fundraisers shaking down scores of businessmen for contributions of what amounted to protection money.

A convicted felon in Florida paroled early from Federal prison at around the same time he makes a secret \$30,000 cash contribution to the Nixon campaign.

The \$600,000 contributed to the Nixon campaign by the trucking industry at the same time it is fighting a government proposal to increase competition in highway shipping.

The Chairman of the Board of a major auto company being approached for

a contribution by Nixon fundraisers at the same time the industry is planning an aggressive campaign to water down Federal auto emission standards.

A \$200,000 contribution to the Nixon campaign by carpet manufacturers at the same time the carpet lobby is desperately trying to postpone enforcement of new flammability regulations.

A \$100,000 contribution to the Nixon campaign by a man named shortly thereafter as Ambassador to the Netherlands, and \$300,000 from a woman later named as Ambassador to Luxembourg.

A secret \$46,000 cash contribution from the chairman of Occidental Petroleum Co., which later announced an \$8 billion, 20-year fertilizer agreement with the Soviet Union, and a \$10 billion natural gas project in Siberia.

The \$30,000 in secret cash contributions from executives of a Houston pipeline company, which later announced a project to bring natural gas from Russia to the east coast of the United States—a deal requiring the approval of the Nixon administration.

A huge contribution from ITT to help underwrite the GOP National Convention mysteriously coinciding with an antitrust settlement between ITT and the Justice Department—a settlement highly beneficial to ITT.

This is what the public has seen. Heaven knows what it has not seen, in both political parties.

We cannot be sure in any single case that there is a direct connection between the contribution and the benefit received or the harm avoided.

But what is more important is that millions of Americans believe, with justification, that there is a direct connection in many. And that is what is so corrosive and damaging to public trust in government.

Our form of government simply cannot continue to function if millions of Americans believe it is being bought and corrupted by rich and powerful special interests.

Abraham Lincoln once said that—
With public sentiment, nothing can fail.
Without it, nothing can succeed.

What is at stake here today is nothing less than the future of our democracy. It is a test of whether government of the people, by the people, and for the people can, as Lincoln said, long endure.

It is a test which we cannot fail.
We must act now—today—to clean up American Government and make certain that a Watergate never again disgraces our democracy.

I urge the Senate to invoke the rule of cloture, to bring this filibuster to an end, and to act now to stem the corrosion of our political process.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONDALE. I yield.

Mr. NUNN. Would not, in every instance cited by the Senator, legislation which has passed the Senate, prohibiting large contributions, correct that? Would

that not be corrected by legislation which has already passed the Senate and is now pending in the House?

Mr. MONDALE. The answer is "No," because the bill we passed, dealing with trying to cleanse the private system of campaign funding proved another thing: If you really clean up the private funding, it is not possible to get enough funds to run; so we need a system of cleansed private funding plus public contributions.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I yield the Senator 2 minutes. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MONDALE. I yield.
Mr. LONG. Is it not also true that the bill we passed permits contributions of \$3,000 per individual?

Mr. MONDALE. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. The people about whom we are talking have large connections. They have banking connections all over the United States and with foreign nations. They have connections with contractors and subcontractors' groups to the extent that, as a practical matter, any one of several of these major committees could have financed the whole campaign with \$3,000 contributions, if they had to do it that way, and find it to their advantage.

Mr. MONDALE. I think it is obvious to most persons who have bothered to study this subject that it is impossible to cleanse the present system of private financing and make it possible for a person to raise enough money to run for President. Therefore, if we cleanse the system, we must either back a system of public financing—this is what we are trying to do—to do away with a record of pervasive corruption which both parties are subject to—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I yield the Senator 1 minute.

Mr. MONDALE. Several top officers testified that Government, which had great power, came to them and said, "Either we get this money from you"—we used to call it extortion in law school—"or other things might happen to you that you won't like."

The question is, Do we want to end that system? We all know about it. We are all in politics. There is no mystery about it. There is no one here who does not hate the private system. It demeans one. It sometimes corrupts him. The marvel is that it is as honest as it is. Let us attempt to do something about it this Sunday morning and throw the money changers out of the temple.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, first I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK), then I shall yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York (Mr. BUCKLEY), and then 2 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senators will be recognized in that order.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alabama.

I have been sitting here on this good

Sunday morning listening to the pious speeches from the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Minnesota, most of which have been based on the fact that you have to throw the private givers out of a Presidential campaign.

As a matter of fact, listening to the speeches, I thought perhaps we were talking about a different bill, because the bill which is before us requires that one get private contributions before he can even get any money out of the Federal Treasury. No matter how far one reaches in, he still has to have \$100,000 to start with.

The second thing that interests me is that nobody is trying to kill this bill forever. There is no reason why it cannot go to the committee, be reported out of the committee, and be debated in the ordinary course like any other bill; but to attach it to the public debt limit seems to me to be deliberately trying to stall the whole economy of this country.

I do not happen to like the debt limit. I have said so on many occasions. It is a movable finish line. Every time we in Congress—and we are the ones doing it—increase the debt, then we move the finish line by increasing the debt limit, and we say to ourselves this has to be done because the economy of the country is going to go to pot unless we do, and then we go ahead and add that to an increase in the debt limit so we will not ruin that economy. We put on it this type of bill, which is not only controversial to start with, but which no one, as the Senator from Alabama has so clearly said, really understands.

I would say that, in listening to all this conversation about the Presidential political scene in the last election, wholly overlooked in the arguments has been the fact that the bill as it stands before us not only covers Presidential campaigns but also covers senatorial and congressional campaigns, so that everyone who will be running in 1976 or later, when the bill becomes effective, at that time has a personal interest in this bill, so that they can reach into the taxpayers' money and start getting some campaign funding for their own campaign.

To me, that is wrong. I happen to be lucky in this situation, because I do not come up in 1976; I come up in 1974. So it will not benefit me one way or the other. But I will say, whether it did or not, I cannot conceive of a worse situation than what we have here when we are trying to preserve the economy at a time of energy shortages and a lot of other problems, to be able to say we cannot raise the debt limit because we are more interested in getting into the taxpayer's pocket in order to finance political campaigns. It just makes no sense to me at all.

I am happy to say, whether we have an administration that is against this bill or for it, I am for the Senator from Alabama and I will be happy to sit and argue it and talk against this bill as long as he will give me time to do it.

It just makes no sense whatsoever for the Senate, which is supposed to be a deliberative body, to be talking about something which they do not have before it, which we know is nothing more than a measure to cover the financing of politi-

cal campaigns at a Federal level in 1976 or thereafter, and then get up and make pious speeches about what has been going on in Federal campaigns probably ever since the country started. It makes no sense at all.

Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Alabama for yielding.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. President, I think the vital question before us now is not the question of how we should finance Federal campaigns. Certainly it is not to this issue that I intend to speak. Rather, I think what we are confronted with is a corruption of the legislative process through the use of so-called veto-proof bills as a vehicle for facing the adoption of totally unrelated measures. This practice constitutes a perversion of the Constitution of the United States. It is a practice that ought not to be tolerated in this Chamber.

The Constitution states that the majority of the Congress will work its will, and that if the President disagrees, he may exercise his right of veto. However, the Congress may vote to override that veto and the bill then becomes law.

The attempt to tack on unrelated legislation to a measure vital to the fiscal integrity of the United States is, to me, unconscionable—especially when there is not even the excuse of urgency.

We have heard a lot of talk in this Chamber about the low esteem into which the Executive has fallen. We should take cognizance of the fact that, if anything, the Congress of the United States has fallen to an even lower level.

The people of the United States are well aware of this appalling exercise of legislative irresponsibility on the part of Congress.

I believe we should be ashamed of ourselves and that we should allow the Senator from Alabama to have a vote on his motion to have the Senate recede from its amendments. And I believe that we should return to the Lord's business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, first I would like to commend the able and distinguished Senator from Alabama for leading the fight on this matter. The Senator from Alabama is in his first term as a U.S. Senator.

I am pleased to state now, although I am on the other side of the aisle from him, that he has become one of the most forward Senators and one of the most effective Members of this body.

First, I would like to say that I understand the question is whether we are going to apply cloture here. In many instances when some of us have tried to carry on debate, there has been objection.

A few years ago I remember the satellite bill, and I could refer to others, when the so-called liberal element of the Senate was determined to debate the matter. However, they are now taking the opposite view. They now say how horrendous and how terrible a thing it is.

It is my judgment that the Senate has a right to carry on extended debate under the rules of the Senate. It is proper to do so. I do not criticize any Member on the other side of the aisle or this side of the aisle for carrying on extended debate on any subject.

However, I want to say that I hope cloture will not be invoked here because there is an attempt here to attach to this extended debt limit bill a completely new subject, one of far-reaching importance, one that involves a restructuring of the entire election system of this Nation.

At the present time, Mr. President, the permanent debt limit is \$400 billion. The temporary debt limit is \$465 billion. All that this bill does is to extend this debt limit by \$10.7 billion, which would make the debt limit \$475.7 billion.

I realize that some people do not wish to extend the debt limit. I have voted against extending the debt limit because we cannot keep on spending more than we take in year after year. However, we have been doing this for a very long time. For instance, in the last 30 years, I believe that we have not balanced the budget except for 6 years.

Congress might attempt to pass this off on whatever administration is in power. However, we cannot do this. Congress is responsible for authorizing appropriations. Congress is responsible for appropriating money. Presidents can recommend.

We can go back for the last 30 years, and all of the Presidents that we have had could recommend. However, they make a mistake when they recommend budgets that contain expenditures greater than our income.

Congress has to make this system work. It is a tripartite system of government. The Executive merely administers and executes the laws passed by Congress. And if Congress spends more than it takes in, Congress has only itself to blame. We are responsible.

Today the Members of the Congress have spent more than we have been taking in. It is unsound. We cannot keep on as we are going now. No individual can stay in business who spends more than he takes in. No company can stay in business when it spends more than it takes in. No government can succeed when it spends more than it takes in. And that is what we have been doing for a long time.

I am anxious that this matter come to an end. However, on the other hand, I think that it is not proper to attach this measure on a bill that is of tremendous and paramount importance.

Mr. President, in my judgment, Congress will make a mistake if it applies cloture rather than letting the debt limit bill be acted upon separately.

It is a great mistake, I think, to attach to a fiscal matter a very important fiscal matter, a very important piece of election legislation. The political campaign matter is important enough in itself to constitute an important piece of legislation.

I hope that cloture will not be applied. The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem-

pore. The 5 minutes of the Senator have expired.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, this is a far-reaching measure. As the distinguished Senator from New York (Mr. BUCKLEY) has pointed out, if we allow an extraneous matter of this importance to be attached to a must piece of legislation, we effectively amend the Constitution, because it wipes out the President's veto power which he can exercise when undesirable legislation is passed.

This measure, if its time has come, can withstand congressional hearings. It can withstand debate on the floor. It can be enacted on its own without riding piggy-back on a piece of must legislation.

Mr. President, I am going to answer the challenge that has been made, because it has been said that the Senator from Alabama and the others aligned with him are holding up a vote on this important matter.

I would like to point out that the Senator from Alabama on one occasion asked for unanimous consent that we recede from our amendments and pass the bill. Twice we put in a motion to recede from our amendments. Those who would have us pass the bill in its present form, and those who favor the campaign subsidies have prevented that issue from coming to a vote on the floor of the Senate. The Senate will not send the bill to the President and recede from its amendments.

Why should the Senate not be allowed to vote? By obstructive tactics on the part of those who favor the campaign subsidy, that issue has not been allowed to be presented to the Senate. Therefore, I issue this challenge: that after the vote on cloture, if cloture is rejected, there be a vote on the motion to recede. I hope the Senate will not be blocked by filibuster, as it was yesterday, or by a motion to adjourn, as it was yesterday, but that the matter will be brought to a vote.

Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to the chairman of the Watergate Committee.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, before doing that, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ALLEN. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is the Senator willing to abide by a vote of the Senate? Would the Senator permit a majority of the Members of this body and the House of Representatives to express the will of the American people? If the Senator is issuing a challenge, will he abide by a similar challenge?

Mr. ALLEN. Of course, we will abide by the will of the Senate.

Mr. KENNEDY. If the majority of the Senators vote against it, will the Senator abide by the result?

Mr. ALLEN. Let us give Senators an opportunity to express themselves.

Now, Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to the distinguished chairman of the Watergate Committee, the committee appointed to seek a remedy for the ills of the present campaign system.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I intend to vote against cloture, for two reasons.

In the first place, I think it is time to abolish debt ceilings or to adopt a realistic debt ceiling which will be honored and observed.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, would the Senator use his microphone?

Mr. ALLEN. Would the Senator use his microphone?

Mr. ERVIN. Very well. Ever since I have been in the Senate, Congress has been engaging in the futility and the hypocrisy of trying to deceive the American people that we are going to limit expenditures by putting a ceiling upon them. I say, let us be done with that hypocrisy.

I agree with those who advocate the Kennedy amendment that something drastic must be done to regulate campaign contributions and expenditures. We ought not to try to do it on the Senate floor on the spur of the moment without affording Senators a reasonable opportunity to consider whether the remedy proposed would not bring upon the American scene a hundred different candidates who would get \$7 million each out of the Federal coffers.

No reform of magnitude should be made without having the appropriate committee study all relevant proposals, take evidence and views relating to them, and report to the Senate a bill after all the implications of the various proposals are known.

The Rules Committee was studying the Kennedy-Scott proposals and other related proposals on this subject and had not completed its study of them at the time the Kennedy amendment was abruptly and unexpectedly offered as an amendment to the wholly nongermane debt ceiling bill.

Americans can finance campaigns in an honest and honorable manner, I think, without going to the extreme this amendment would require. We should not take money out of the Federal Treasury to finance campaigns; we should finance campaigns by increasing the income tax exemption or credit allowable for contributions to whatever limit is necessary to enable the raising of adequate funds.

We should stop the hypocrisy of prosecuting men for making illegal contributions unless we also prosecute those who solicit such contributions. It has been against the law of this Nation since 1907, if my recollection serves me right, to make contributions for political purposes out of corporate funds. Why should the Department of Justice not prosecute the men who solicit or accept such illegal contributions for aiding and abetting crime, and have them sent to jail? None of the solicitors of such illegal contribution have been prosecuted; only the makers, who were coerced into making the illegal contributions, have been prosecuted and punished.

I propose that the following remedies be studied by the Rules Committee, before the Senate acts on Mr. KENNEDY's amendment to finance Presidential primaries and elections out of tax moneys:

First. Increase the tax exemption or tax credit for every person who makes a campaign contribution to the candidate

or party of his choice to a reasonable amount.

Second. To make it certain that all of these contributions will be reported, establish a commission, a bipartisan commission, to supervise Federal elections.

Third. Require the man who receives the contribution or the committee which receives the contribution to report its receipt forthwith to that commission, and require the man who makes the contribution to notify the Internal Revenue Service that he has made the contribution and expects to claim it as an exemption or a credit on his income tax return.

Fourth. Increase the penalties for violations of election laws, and enforce such penalties.

Since there are upward of 60 million voters in the United States, political fundraisers should be encouraged to raise campaign funds by obtaining voluntary tax-exempt contributions from citizens and be deterred by drastic criminal law, from coercing large contributions from corporations or unions.

By that method we could finance political campaigns in the United States without reaching into the Federal Treasury and without encouraging a multitude of candidates to seek nominations and elections to the Presidency for the purpose of getting their hands on millions of dollars of Federal funds.

I expect to vote against cloture. I would vote for a motion to recede. I think this whole proposition needs substantial study in the Rules Committee, because I know the Senate has not been able to give it any adequate consideration during the few hours we have discussed it on the Senate floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired. The Senator from Louisiana has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

There is no Senator's home in which the Senator from North Carolina is more admired than in the home of the Senator from Louisiana. It was my good fortune to marry the very fine person who was the Senator's secretary, and we admire him, I think, as much as anyone other than his own wife could admire him.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the Senator committed the grandest larceny ever committed when he stole my charming secretary from my staff to make her his bride.

Mr. LONG. Admiring the Senator as we do, we have concluded that the reason the Senator has taken the stand he has on this issue is only that he has never had the problem we have had trying to raise campaign money. The people of his State hold him in such high esteem that he has never had any fundraising problems.

Mr. President, this is not a veto-proof bill. The President can veto it if he wants to. But the Senate is barred, under the Constitution, from initiating revenue bills, so the only way the Senate can move in a revenue area of this sort is by amending a bill that has been passed by the House of Representatives. And if we believe a matter to be as important as

the Senate seems to believe this matter to be, naturally we would try to resolve the issue on a bill which the President would be very reluctant to veto, such as this one, and seek a confrontation on a "must" bill, which must become law in one fashion or another.

That is what the Senate has done. The Senate has espoused to initiate the issue in a way that would accomplish its purpose.

If we do not put this measure on a significant revenue bill, as the Senate has done, the attempt would be fruitless. So while I did not advocate it and was not a sponsor of this amendment, I completely respect the right of Senators to bring the issue to a conclusion in this fashion. They have a right to do it.

I have been looking over the rollcall votes on this issue, both yesterday, the day before, and in years past. When this matter first came up, the people of this Nation had little understanding of it. We were told that those of us who were attempting to finance campaigns at the expense of the taxpayer were wrong, that the public would not understand or approve.

What has happened? Those of us who have taken the position of those who are seeking to move forward in the area of campaign financing by the public have picked up votes; we have won elections; we are picking up States. We are picking up converts. In other words, there are Senators who have not voted with us in the past who are voting with us now.

We are picking up converts among the American people. We have been back before them, and are winning elections.

I submit, Mr. President, that those of us who favor this concept, which the public is coming to understand better and better day by day, are going to have an overwhelming victory at the polls next year. Only time will tell, but the whole trend has been in our favor.

There have been those who said the answer was to have more reporting of more information to the American public, and more accountability. So we give them their reporting and their accountability and we have opened up those doors and let the light shine through.

CALL OF THE ROLL

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. Moss). The hour of 11 o'clock having arrived, and pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair now directs the clerk to call the roll and ascertain the presence of a quorum.

The legislative clerk called the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

Abourezk	Byrd,	Ervin
Alken	Harry F., Jr.	Fannin
Allen	Byrd, Robert C.	Fong
Bartlett	Cannon	Gravel
Bayh	Case	Griffin
Beall	Chiles	Hansen
Bellmon	Church	Hart
Bennett	Clark	Hartke
Bentsen	Cook	Haskell
Bible	Cranston	Hathaway
Biden	Curtis	Helms
Brock	Dole	Hollings
Brooke	Domenici	Hruska
Buckley	Dominick	Huddleston
Burdick	Eastland	Humphrey

[No. 544 Leg.]

Inouye	Montoya	Stafford
Jackson	Moss	Stennis
Johnston	Muskie	Stevens
Kennedy	Nelson	Stevenson
Long	Nunn	Talmadge
Magnuson	Pastore	Thurmond
Mansfield	Pell	Tower
Mathias	Proxmire	Tunney
McClellan	Ribicoff	Welcker
McGovern	Roth	Williams
McIntyre	Schweiker	Young
Metcalf	Scott, Hugh	
Mondale	Sparkman	

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH) are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON) is absent because of illness.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), the Senator from Florida (Mr. GURNEY), the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. SAXBE), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT) are necessarily absent.

Also, the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. PEARSON), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON) is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Idaho (Mr. McCLEURE) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. PACKWOOD) are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I would hope that after this vote is concluded we would be able to vote on the motion to recede and then on the Long motion—1, 2, 3—so that we could dispose of this matter once and for all and have it settled.

Would the Senator from Alabama agree to vote on a 1, 2, 3 basis?

Mr. ALLEN. We would take them one at a time. Let us vote one at a time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. All right. Keeping an open mind?

Mr. ALLEN. Absolutely.

Mr. STENNIS addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the rule, we must proceed. The clerk will state the motion before the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate upon the motion to insist on the Senate amendments, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and authorize the Chair to appoint conferees on the bill H.R. 11104, an act to provide for a temporary increase of \$10,700,000,000 in the public debt limit and to extend the period to which this temporary limit applies to June 30, 1974.

1. Mike Mansfield	12. Charles H. Percy
2. Hugh Scott	13. Gaylord Nelson
3. Walter F. Mondale	14. Thomas J. McIntyre
4. Robert C. Byrd	15. Quentin N. Burdick
5. Edward M. Kennedy	16. Joseph R. Biden
6. Edmund S. Muskie	17. Hubert H. Humphrey
7. Lawton Chiles	18. Henry M. Jackson
8. Philip A. Hart	19. Jennings Randolph
9. Alan Cranston	
10. John O. Pastore	
11. Harrison A. Williams	

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, may we have order?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order before we proceed.

Pursuant to rule XXII, a rollcall has been had, and a quorum is present.

The question before the Senate is, Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate on the pending motion shall be brought to a close? The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to maintain order and to ask Senators to keep their seats during the rollcall.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair requests that all Senators remain in their seats and answer the rollcall audibly.

The Chair admonishes the galleries to be quiet during the rollcall procedure.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CANNON (after having voted in the negative). On this vote, I have a live pair with the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON). If they were here, they would each vote "yea." I have already voted "nay."

I withdraw my vote.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH) are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON) is absent because of illness.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), the Senator from Florida (Mr. GURNEY), the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. SAXBE), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT) are necessarily absent.

Also, the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. PEARSON), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON) is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Idaho (Mr. McCLEURE) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. PACKWOOD) are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 47, nays 33, as follows:

[No. 545 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Abourezk	Haskell	Mondale
Bayh	Hathaway	Montoya
Beall	Hollings	Moss
Bentsen	Huddleston	Muskie
Biden	Humphrey	Nelson
Brooke	Inouye	Pastore
Burdick	Jackson	Pell
Byrd, Robert C.	Johnston	Proxmire
Case	Kennedy	Ribicoff
Chiles	Long	Schweiker
Church	Magnuson	Scott, Hugh
Clark	Mansfield	Stafford
Cranston	Mathias	Stevenson
Gravel	McGovern	Tunney
Hart	McIntyre	Williams
Hartke	Metcalf	

NAYS—33

Aiken	Dole	Nunn
Allen	Domenici	Roth
Bartlett	Dominick	Sparkman
Bellmon	Eastland	Stennis
Bennett	Ervin	Stevens
Bible	Fannin	Talmadge
Brock	Fong	Thurmond
Buckley	Griffin	Tower
Byrd,	Hansen	Weicker
Harry F., Jr.	Helms	Young
Cook	Hruska	
Curtis	McClellan	

PRESENT AND GIVING A LIVE PAIR, AS PREVIOUSLY RECORDED—1

Cannon, against.

NOT VOTING—19

Baker	Hughes	Randolph
Cotton	Javits	Saxbe
Eagleton	McClure	Scott,
Fulbright	McGee	William L.
Goldwater	Packwood	Symington
Gurney	Pearson	Taft
Hatfield	Percy	

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. On this vote the yeas are 47 and the nays are 33. Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting not having voted in the affirmative, the motion to close debate is not agreed to.

The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN) that the Senate recede from its amendments on H.R. 11104.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may I express the hope that we can come to a vote on this right now.

Mr. ALLEN. I am ready. Yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN).

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH) are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON) is absent because of illness.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), the Senator from Florida (Mr. GURNEY), the

Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. SAXBE), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT) are necessarily absent.

Also, the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. PEARSON), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON) is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Idaho (Mr. McCLELLAN) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. PACKWOOD) are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) would each vote "nay."

If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 45, as follows:

[No. 546 Leg.]

YEAS—36

Aiken	Curtis	McClellan
Allen	Dole	Nunn
Bartlett	Domenici	Roth
Beall	Dominick	Sparkman
Bellmon	Eastland	Stennis
Bennett	Ervin	Stevens
Bible	Fannin	Talmadge
Brock	Fong	Thurmond
Buckley	Griffin	Tower
Byrd,	Hansen	Weicker
Harry F., Jr.	Helms	Young
Cannon	Hollings	
Cook	Hruska	

NAYS—45

Abourezk	Haskell	Mondale
Bayh	Hathaway	Montoya
Bentsen	Huddleston	Moss
Biden	Humphrey	Muskie
Brooke	Inouye	Nelson
Burdick	Jackson	Pastore
Byrd, Robert C.	Johnston	Pell
Case	Kennedy	Proxmire
Chiles	Long	Ribicoff
Church	Magnuson	Schweiker
Clark	Mansfield	Scott, Hugh
Cranston	Mathias	Stafford
Gravel	McGovern	Stevenson
Hart	McIntyre	Tunney
Hartke	Metcalf	Williams

NOT VOTING—19

Baker	Hughes	Randolph
Cotton	Javits	Saxbe
Eagleton	McClure	Scott,
Fulbright	McGee	William L.
Goldwater	Packwood	Symington
Gurney	Pearson	Taft
Hatfield	Percy	

So Mr. ALLEN's motion that the Senate recede from its amendments was rejected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now recurs on the motion to insist on the Senate amendments to H.R. 11104, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and to authorize the Chair to appoint conferees thereon.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unan-

imous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Montana without losing my right to the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk and ask that it be read.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair, without objection, directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read the motion, as follows:

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate upon the motion to insist on the Senate amendments, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and authorize the Chair to appoint conferees on the bill H.R. 11104, an act to provide for a temporary increase of \$10,700,000,000 in the public debt limit and to extend the period to which this temporary limit applies to June 30, 1974.

Signed by 19 Senators:

1. Mike Mansfield	11. Walter D. Huddleston
2. Robert C. Byrd	12. Lee Metcalf
3. Hugh Scott	13. Harrison A. Williams
4. Dick Clark	14. T. J. McIntyre
5. Walter R. Mondale	15. Hubert H. Humphrey
6. Edward M. Kennedy	16. Philip A. Hart
7. Frank E. Moss	17. Vance Hartke
8. Edward W. Brooke	18. Mike Gravel
9. John O. Pastore	19. John V. Tunney
10. Warren G. Magnuson	

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I wish to address this message from the Senate to the President of the United States.

It seems fairly clear to me that there is a very strong feeling on the part of both the proponents of this proposal for public financing of Presidential campaigns and on the part of the opponents. It is one in which the President, in my judgment, has already taken a very decided interest and one in which the President is going to have to take a public interest.

I would advise the President that he should favor the ordinary legislative process whereby we would be permitted to express the majority view of both the House and the Senate and advance this measure to his desk.

If he vetoes the bill and if we do not have the power to override his veto of the bill with a Presidential campaign funds amendment attached to the bill, then I for one will vote to pass a debt limit bill without any riders on it.

However, it seems to me that the orderly legislative process is such that the President and those who support his position at this moment are in a position that the President will not support a filibuster if, by definition, it is an act of piracy.

I am not saying that to cast any invid-

ious aspersions on anyone. I have engaged in filibusters many times myself. I would be insincere if I were to try to say that Senators who feel strongly enough about a matter to engage in a filibuster should not do so. However, on the other hand, this matter must be resolved. And we will have a test of nerves starting on about Wednesday when the Government employees do not receive their paychecks and when contractors are not paid.

So, those who have voted consistently that this matter come to a conclusion and that the Senate be permitted to legislate on this matter will be put to a test and we will decide the matter. The President will then have to take a position as he has in the times past on this matter.

I would suggest to him that when he does so, his view should be that the Senate and House should act by majority vote, as we have the power to do, when we are permitted to vote. And he would do his part just by signing or vetoing the bill. If he vetoes it, when it comes back to the Congress, if we are not able to override the veto, my judgment is that he will have a bill back on his desk in 24 or 48 hours. In the event we are not able to override on that issue, the President will have prevailed even though I am convinced that his stand is unpopular in the polls.

At the same time, however, this is a matter on which we are entitled to legislate, and I believe we should. I do not believe that anything could be gained by the Senate staying in session and hearing speeches today.

I subscribe pretty much to the prayer of our Chaplain this morning, the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), when he asked the Deity to forgive us for being in session on this day.

So I would support a motion that the Senate adjourn and listen to further speeches tomorrow.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I so yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Louisiana and his supporters would agree to a vote on the pending motion at the hour of 12 o'clock.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I would be delighted to have a vote on the motion that the Senate insists on its amendments.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on my motion that the Senate insist on its amendments at 12 o'clock today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. ALLEN. I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

By unanimous consent the following routine morning business was transacted:

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

S. 2505

At the request of Mr. METCALF, the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONROYA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2505, to provide, under the Social Security Act, for additional Federal payments to States on account of specified public assistance expenditures with respect to Indians, Aleuts, Eskimos, native Hawaiians or other aboriginal persons.

S. 2718

At the request of Mr. PELL, the Senator from California (Mr. TUNNEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2718, to provide for the financing of Federal election campaigns, and for other purposes.

EMERGENCY DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME ENERGY CONSERVATION ACT OF 1973—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 755

(Ordered to be printed, and to lie on the table.)

EARLY MORNING RADIO SERVICE FOR RURAL AMERICANS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words regarding an amendment to the daylight saving time bill which I submit at this time.

The amendment deals with the problem daytime stations and full-time radio stations which operate at a substantially reduced power level during the night, would experience if we were to pass the daylight saving time bill.

These stations are currently prohibited from broadcasting or only permitted to broadcast at low-power levels during the presunrise hours. In the past, without year-round daylight saving time, they are able to come on the air at sunrise and provide news and information to their listeners before the listeners leave for work or begin their day's activity.

With year round daylight saving time, many of the daytime stations will not be able to begin broadcasting until as late as 8:30 or 8:45 in the morning. Thus they will not be able to provide the vital information to their listeners before they begin their activities.

The amendment I am submitting today is similar to the amendment I introduced with Senators HELMS, HUGH SCOTT, and THURMOND on November 16.

In addition to these previous sponsors, Senator BUCKLEY and Senator SCHWEIKER and my colleague from Kansas, Senator PEARSON, have also joined as sponsors of this amendment.

The amendment provides that the Federal Communications Commission shall, consistent with existing treaty agreements, make any adjustments in their general rules or take interim action pending the adjustment in such general rules, that might be necessary to insure that the radio audiences which are served by daytime stations are not deprived of this service during the crucial early morning hours if year round daylight saving time is passed.

This amendment is extremely important to rural areas, since radio in rural America provides a very valuable service which is heavily relied upon. It brings

local and community news, notices of coming events, weather reports, school openings or closings, stockman warnings, and much additional information which is indispensable to many citizens in rural areas in particular. These areas do not usually have morning newspapers and many people are out in their cars and trucks away from television. So radio provides an essential service for these communities and is especially vital to them during the early morning hours. Thus I feel that if Congress passes the year-round daylight savings time measure, it is essential that we include in it adequate protection for radio services to rural communities whose early risers would be most detrimentally affected by the legislation in the first place.

The House, in acting on their daylight saving time legislation included in their bill an amendment similar to the one I am now introducing and Dean Burch, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission has in a letter to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee stated that inclusion of statutory language similar to that which I have included in my amendment, would be helpful to the Commission in dealing with this problem.

I am, therefore, submitting this amendment and am hopeful my colleagues will join in support of the measure.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMENDMENT No. 755

On page 6, at the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any other law or any regulation issued under any such law, the Federal Communications Commission shall, consistent with any existing treaty or other agreement, make such adjustment by general rules, or by interim action pending such general rules, to permit daytime standard amplitude modulation broadcast stations to operate not in excess of one hour prior to local sunrise, as may be consistent with the public interest, including the public's interest in receiving interference-free service. Such general rules, or interim action, may include variances with respect to operating power and other technical operating characteristics, but no such daytime station shall have its operating power reduced below 500 watts or fifty per cent of its daytime power whichever is greater for such hour of presunrise operation. Subsequent to the adoption of such general rules, they may be varied with respect to particular stations and areas because of the exigencies in each case. Provisions of this section shall also apply to those full time stations which currently have pre-sunrise broadcasting authority but for whom such authority permits broadcasting at a substantially reduced power compared with their daytime broadcasting operations.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

JOBS FOR VETERANS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, today, almost a year after the United States withdrew its military forces from Viet-

nam, there are more than 275,000 Vietnam era veterans without jobs. And with the present energy crisis, a considerable number of those who had gotten jobs are being laid off. Lack of jobs for these veterans has been the result of hard luck and no opportunity. Too many veterans are unaware of the agencies and programs offering educational and occupational assistance.

One of the organizations which has been outstanding in its efforts to help unemployed veterans is Jobs for Veterans. It has published "A Digest of Veteran-Related Programs for Jobs, Training and Education." The Digest catalogs the responsibilities, services and addresses of agencies and programs set up to help veterans, including financial assistance plans. Jobs for Veterans is to be commended for its work, which is needed more than ever today.

THE ENERGY CRISIS

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, in this week's newsletter issued to my constituents, I noted the lack of an energy policy in this Government. Emphasizing the confusion, I pointed out the numerous switches in President Nixon's approach, or lack of approach, in the last year. I likened this procedure to Sealtest ice cream with a flavor of the week. Now we have a new flavor, Mr. Simon of Treasury with a temporary Office of Energy Administration. I like this flavor. But it is not permanent. It does not have credibility, for apparently the President will change again. There is no duty to consolidate all data. There is no communication between the Congress and the President, since we do not have powers to confirm. I ask unanimous consent that the following report be included in the RECORD to point up this dilemma.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ENERGY CRISIS

There was an old saying aboard ship in World War II, "When in danger, when in doubt, run in circles, scream and shout." Such is Washington's reaction to the energy crisis. It's been coming. The brown-outs in northeastern United States in '65 and '66 gave us the warning, but we were too busy with the Vietnam War to listen. Suffice it to say, President Nixon did not cause the energy crisis. But the President is the only one who can prevent the crisis from becoming a catastrophe. And if he doesn't act decisively by January 1, then instead of just cooler homes, Americans will be cooling their heels—out of a job.

We are in an energy crisis because:

1. TREMENDOUS CONSUMPTION—TREMENDOUS WASTE

The U.S., 6 percent of the world's population, consumes over 35 percent of the world's total energy. More important, *we waste more than we consume*. Large glass office buildings waste two-thirds of the energy needed in their operation.

2. SPIRALING CONSUMPTION

In the next 10 years, the United States will use as much oil and gas as it used from the beginning of its history until the year 1970. To compound the problem, the rest of the world is consuming energy at a faster rate than the United States. For example,

the world as a whole will use as much energy between 1970 and 2000 as it did from the start of mankind until 1970.

3. REFUSAL TO ELIMINATE OIL IMPORT QUOTAS

President Nixon's Cabinet Task Force on Oil Imports headed by Secretary Shultz recommended that oil import quotas be eliminated in 1970. However, the President overruled this recommendation and the millions of barrels of oil that could have been imported and refined during the last 4 years were never received. This is the primary reason why not a single additional oil refinery has been constructed in the United States in the last 4 years.

4. NO RESERVE CAPACITY

A 9 month reserve was recommended to avoid a crisis. However, we failed to develop a reserve capacity from the oil received. The Arabs never would have mandated an immediate cut-off if they knew we had 9 months supply time to develop domestic production.

5. DELAY IN POWER PLANT CONSTRUCTION

New conventional and nuclear power plants have been delayed on an average of 26 months due to technical and environmental difficulties.

6. INSUFFICIENT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The numerous research and development proposals in Congress for coal gasification, thermo-nuclear energy, solar energy, etc.—all were opposed by the Administration until recently on the basis that the private sector could do the job and no further federal incentives were needed.

7. SHORTAGE OF NATURAL GAS SUPPLIES

For years the Administration's policy of deregulation has encouraged withholding of supplies because of the expectation of large windfall profits in the future. At a price of 25 cents per Mcf of gas, the average profit of the natural gas company is 18 percent—more than adequate. However, with deregulation, immediately the price would jump to 75 cents, thereby creating an expectation of profits of over 200 percent.

8. FEDERAL TAX POLICIES HAVE ENCOURAGED THE PETROLEUM INDUSTRY TO SEARCH FOR AND PRODUCE ENERGY RESOURCES ABROAD RATHER THAN AT HOME

An oil company is eligible for depletion allowances, intangible drilling expense deductions, and foreign investment tax credits on its operations abroad. High royalty payments to foreign governments become high tax credits, thereby encouraging investment abroad rather than at home.

9. GOVERNMENT POLICIES HISTORICALLY WRONG

Rather than encouraging prudent usage of energy, government has encouraged energy waste. For example, more highways rather than mass transit, lower cost of energy the more you use, inadequate insulation standards in housing, etc.

10. BUT MOST OF ALL, NO ONE IS IN CHARGE!

The responsibility for energy policy is spread over 73 agencies and departments of government. One would think that Governor Love, whom President Nixon calls his "Energy Czar," would be in charge, but appearing on the "Today" Show, Governor Love, when asked about gasoline rationing said he didn't know. But, he continued, "an inter-agency group pulled together by OMB is working on a plan." OMB is the Office of Management and Budget charged with fiscal affairs, not energy affairs. OMB is staffed with fiscal experts—not energy experts. And so we have in place of a policy, organized chaos. Secretary Morton says we will have rationing by January. Secretary Shultz says over his dead body! Herbert Stein, Economic Counselor, and Melvin Laird recommend 30 cents tax on a gallon of gas and then comes the President blaming Congress. No one seriously suggests that the legislative branch is

equipped to promulgate a policy on energy. The problem is complex and the committee system of Congress forbids a comprehensive approach. The Commerce Committee has jurisdiction over the Federal Power Commission, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has jurisdiction over nuclear power plants. Public Works Committee has the government hydroelectric dams. The Interior Committee has fossil fuels. Foreign Relations and Finance have jurisdiction over Mid-East oil—there is no one committee of Congress to cope with the problem spreading through 73 agencies. Accordingly, we need one place in the executive branch to go to for energy policy.

Foreseeing this dilemma, I introduced in June of 1972 a bill to institute an Energy Policy Council in the White House. It provides 3 persons appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate with its director or chairman being the Energy Czar. Continuity and communication between the legislative and executive branches is guaranteed by the confirmatory power in the Senate. Best of all, this Policy Council is charged not only with promulgating a policy to be updated annually, but it was specifically directed to corral all the statistics. Every time you hear one of these "energy experts," he is using one set of figures and someone else has different figures. No one knows the truth. The oil companies and natural gas companies are reluctant to give the true facts. So here was a simple plan which passed the Senate overwhelmingly on May 10. It passed over White House opposition and the White House continues to oppose the bill in the House.

Trying to get an energy policy out of this Administration is like pulling teeth. Until the President's re-election last year, the President's energy man was Peter Flanagan in the White House who said there was no energy problem. However, after the election, the President switched off saying there could be a problem and appointed Dr. Kenneth Lay, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Interior for energy. The ink wasn't dry on this order before in December the President changed again and stated that Mr. James E. Akins of the State Department was preparing the President's energy message to the next Congress. Then in January, 1973, the President changed completely, appointing his so-called "Super-Cabinet" of 4 departments, one—the Department of Natural Resources, Secretary Earl Butz was put in charge of this department and named Counselor to the President in charge of energy. But in February the President changed again, appointing Presidential Advisors Shultz, Kissinger and Ehrlichman as the President's Special Committee on Energy. These advisors were so busy with other responsibilities, it was hard to get a quorum. So next the President appointed Mr. Charles DiBona as Special Consultant to the President on Energy. Mr. DiBona prepared a 42 page term paper on energy and submitted it as the President's Message to the Congress on Energy on April 18, 1973. This contained much rhetoric and little substance. In the meantime, Mr. William Simon, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, was appearing at Congressional hearings on energy matters and he seemed to have the best grasp of the situation. However, when the Congress started working closely with him, the President cancelled him out on June 29th with the appointment of Governor Love as the so-called "Energy Czar." So you can see that the President's lead of 7 policies in 7 months has been rather difficult to follow. And, of course, the major ingredient necessary is missing: credibility. When the President speaks, fundamental to the success of his proposals is that the President is believed. An Energy Policy Council would eliminate the internecine warfare between department heads jockeying for position. It would clear the air from countermarching counterproposals. There would be that one

place where the Congress and the people could all go to obtain the truth and this one office would speak for government so that we could all head in the same direction. But for the moment, just when I was beginning to believe Governor Love, he appears saying, no, not me—it's OMB. And just when you think it's OMB, the President says no, it's a special task force. Like Sealtest ice cream, it's the flavor of the week, and if you don't like the government's position this week, wait until next week. And waiting, a crisis becomes a catastrophe.

CRISIS SERIOUS—CRISIS DEEP

The energy crisis is serious. It is deep. There is nothing the President can do, there is nothing the Congress can do to prevent critical shortages between now and 1980. The problem is very complex. It will require billion-dollar research efforts; a crash program like a Manhattan project; long range planning. Hence, the President's "Project Independence"—making the United States independent of any reliance upon foreign sources of supply by 1980. But the main round of this bout lasting until 1980 is what can and must be done in 1974. This is the year of sacrifice. If Americans will tighten their belts 12 months then we can prevent a crisis from becoming a catastrophe.

CRISIS YES, BUT NOT CATASTROPHE

In a capsule, America consumes 18 million barrels of oil a day. A quickening of the Alaska pipeline, a love-in with the Arabs, could vary it slightly, but any way you look at it, we are going to operate with a 3 million barrel shortage daily. This is a crisis. It means until we can develop additional resources, we must move immediately into the gap to eliminate 3 million daily shortage. Experts say this can be done in the following manner:

1. Pick up a million barrels by conservation—lowering the thermostat to 68 degrees, daylight saving time throughout the year, etc.
2. Pick up the second million by increased production—deregulation of natural gas, etc.
3. Pick up the third million by gas rationing.

This last one is a must—now! You can't play with it. You can't edict 50 miles per hour, eliminate Sunday driving, and expect to do the job. This only saves 250,000 barrels and the need is for a million. Moreover, when you set two different speed rates, you have created a problem rather than solved one. These half-measures start people hoarding and consuming, rather than conserving. So before long, the President says, surprisingly, it hasn't worked. With half-measures, the best minds look for the crisis to turn to catastrophe by Springtime. That is, instead of rationing pleasure travel, there will be a cut-off of supplies where people cannot get to work, where fuel for the fiber industry so vital to textiles is drastically cut, where natural gas is unavailable and plants work part-time. This is what you are observing in the stock market. Investors see 2% drop in real growth as a result of the energy shortage, which means a drop of about 15% in corporate profits—they get out of the market and invest in something else.

The remedy is decisive action. We can't dilly. We must spell it out clearly to the people so they understand, not talk in a dozen tongues. We must head off a catastrophe. Every day we delay, we lose one million barrels that we could be gaining from rationing. A delay of six months means 180 million barrels. We lost 61 million in October and November, and this month we are losing another 31 million dillying.

DAVID BEN-GURION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I join the people of Israel and the millions of

Jews and gentiles throughout the world who deeply mourn the passing of David Ben-Gurion.

More than a great leader of his own people, David Ben-Gurion was a permanent symbol to people throughout the world of what people of faith and determination can achieve.

On the 14th day of May 1948 in the museum of Tel Aviv, he read a brief declaration which told the history of the Jewish people, a history of exile, a history of persecution, a history of survival.

When he concluded that proclamation, a proclamation based on the United Nations resolution calling for the establishment of a Jewish State in Israel, the audience recited an ancient Hebrew benediction and then left the museum to face war.

As Abba Eban has written:

Israel was experiencing the joy of birth and fear of death in a single taste; and the physical danger was deepened by political isolation.

David Ben-Gurion led his people in their fight for survival and in their struggle to rebuild the land of Israel. It was an impossible dream but it was a dream that now has lived on for a quarter century. Ben-Gurion said:

In Israel, in order to be a realist you must believe in miracles.

For David Ben-Gurion, there was only one miracle still left undone, the miracle of peace. He believed that the future of Israel could be based only on peace with and respect for its Arab neighbors. He led the nation of Israel as prime minister in its war of independence, and in the first 15 years of its existence.

But he believed that its future rested on peace and he worked in behalf of that goal. He was a great leader and we mourn his passing.

I ask unanimous consent that the aforementioned declaration of Israel's independence be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the declaration was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECLARATION OF ISRAEL'S INDEPENDENCE

Eretz-Israel (the Land of Israel), was the birthplace of the Jewish people. Here their spiritual, religious and political identity was shaped. Here they first attained to statehood, created cultural values of national and universal significance and gave to the world the eternal Book of Books.

After being forcibly exiled from their land, the people kept faith with it throughout their Dispersion and never ceased to pray and hope for their return to it and for the restoration in it of their political freedom.

Impelled by this historic and traditional attachment, Jews strove in every successive generation to re-establish themselves in their ancient homeland. In recent decades they returned in their masses. Pioneers, *ma'apilim* [immigrants coming to Israel in defiance of restrictive regulations], and defenders, they made deserts bloom, revived the Hebrew language, built villages and towns, and created a thriving community, controlling its own economy and culture, loving peace but knowing how to defend itself, bringing the blessings of progress to all the country's inhabitants, and aspiring toward independent nationhood.

In the year 5657 (1897), at the summons of

the spiritual father of the Jewish State, Theodor Herzl, the First Zionist Congress convened and proclaimed the right of the Jewish people to national rebirth in its own country.

This right was recognized in the Balfour Declaration of the 2nd November, 1917, and reaffirmed in the Mandate of the League of Nations which, in particular, gave international sanctions to the historic connection between the Jewish people and Eretz-Israel and to the right of the Jewish people to rebuild its National Home.

The catastrophe which recently befell the Jewish people—the massacre of millions of Jews in Europe—was another clear demonstration of the urgency of solving the problem of its homelessness by re-establishing in Eretz-Israel the Jewish State, which would open the gates of the homeland wide to every Jew and confer upon the Jewish people the status of a fully-privileged member of the comity of nations.

Survivors of the Nazi Holocaust in Europe, as well as Jews from other parts of the world, continued to migrate to Eretz-Israel, undaunted by difficulties, restrictions and dangers, and never ceased to assert their right to a life of dignity, freedom and honest toil in their national homeland.

In the Second World War, the Jewish community of this country contributed its full share to the struggle of the freedom- and peace-loving nations against the forces of Nazi wickedness and, by the blood of its soldiers and its war effort, gained the right to be reckoned among the peoples who founded the United Nations.

On the 29th November, 1947, the United Nations General Assembly passed a resolution calling for the establishment of a Jewish State in Eretz-Israel; the General Assembly required the inhabitants of Eretz-Israel to take such steps as were necessary on their part for the implementation of that resolution. This recognition by the United Nations of the right of the Jewish people to establish their State is irrevocable.

This right is the natural right of the Jewish people to be masters of their own fate, like all other nations, in their own sovereign State.

Accordingly we, Members of the People's Council, representatives of the Jewish Community of Eretz-Israel and of the Zionist movement, are here assembled on the day of the termination of the British Mandate over Eretz-Israel and, by virtue of our natural and historic right and on the strength of the resolution of the United Nations General Assembly, hereby declare the establishment of a Jewish State in Eretz-Israel, to be known as the State of Israel.

We declare that, with effect from the movement of the termination of the Mandate, being tonight, the eve of Sabbath, the 6th Iyar, 5708 (15th May, 1948), until the establishment of the elected, regular authorities of the State in accordance with the Constitution which shall be adopted by the Elected Constituent Assembly not later than the 1st October, 1948, the People's Council shall act as a Provisional Council of State, and its executive organ, the People's Administration, shall be the Provisional Government of the Jewish State, to be called "Israel."

The State of Israel will be open for Jewish immigration and for the Ingathering of the Exiles; it will foster the development of the country for the benefit of all its inhabitants; it will be based on freedom, justice and peace as envisaged by the prophets of Israel; it will ensure complete equality of social and political rights to all its inhabitants irrespective of religion, race, or sex; it will guarantee freedom of religion, conscience, language, education and culture; it will safeguard the Holy Places of all religions; and it will be faithful to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

The State of Israel is prepared to cooperate with the agencies and representatives of the United Nations in implementing the resolution of the General Assembly of the 29th November, 1947, and will take steps to bring about the economic union of the whole of Eretz-Israel.

We appeal to the United Nations to assist the Jewish people in the building-up of its State and to receive the State of Israel into the comity of nations.

We appeal—in the very midst of the onslaught launched against us now for months—to the Arab inhabitants of the State of Israel to preserve peace and participate in the upbuilding of the State on the basis of full and equal citizenship and due representation in all its provisional and permanent institutions.

We extend our hand to all neighboring States and their peoples in an offer of peace and good neighborliness, and appeal to them to establish bonds of cooperation and mutual help with the sovereign Jewish people settled in its own land. The State of Israel is prepared to do its share in common effort for the advancement of the entire Middle East.

We appeal to the Jewish people throughout the Diaspora to rally round the Jews of Eretz-Israel in the tasks of immigration and upbuilding and to stand by them in the great struggle for the realization of the age-old dream—the redemption of Israel.

Placing our trust in the Almighty, we affirm our signatures to this proclamation at this session of the provisional Council of State, on the soil of the homeland, in the city of Tel-Aviv, on this Sabbath Eve, the 5th day of Iyar, 5708 (14th May, 1948).

David Ben Gurion, Daniel Auster, Mordekhai Bentov, Yuczhak Ben Zvi, Eliyahu Berligne, Fritz Bernstein, Rabbi Wolf Gold, Meir Grabovsky, Yitzchak Gruenbaum, Dr. Abraham Granovsky, Eliyahu Dobkin, Meir Wilner Kouvner, Zerach Wabrbafrig, Herzl Vardi, Rachel Cohen, Rabbi Kalman Kahana, Saadia Kobashi, Rabbi Yitzchak Meir Levin, Meir David Loewenstein, Zvi Luria, Golda Myerson, Nachum Nir, Zvi Segal, Rabbi Yehuda Leib.

Hacohen Fishman, David Zvi Pinkas, Abaron Zisling, Moshe Kolodny, Eliezer Kaplan, Abraham Katznelson, Felix Rosenbluth, David Remez, Berli Repetur, Mordekhai Shattner, Ben Zion Sternberg, Bekhor Shitreet, Moshe Shapira, Moshe Shertok.

THE CASE FOR IMPEACHMENT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the editors of the Progressive magazine have made a compelling case for the impeachment of Mr. Nixon in the December 1973 issue of that great magazine.

I am more and more convinced that public respect for constitutional government and the rule of law requires that the Congress carefully investigate and then judge the serious charges made against this incredible administration. We owe it to the public to clear the air surrounding the network of scandals that have come to be known as Watergate.

I ask unanimous consent that the articles from the Progressive be printed at this point in the RECORD:

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Progressive magazine, December 1973]

A CALL TO ACTION

Crisis. The word has been overworked by all of us, and particularly by those engaged in reporting, analyzing, and interpreting the

news. We have been recording monthly, weekly, daily crises for longer than we care to remember—foreign and domestic crises, military and political crises, economic, moral, and cultural crises. A headlined crisis no longer generates alarm, or even profound concern. Ho hum another crisis. . . .

But the crisis that grips America today is of another, higher magnitude—one that deserves, perhaps, a new term that has not been eroded by abuse. It swirls, of course, around the person of the President of the United States, but it impinges on every facet of the national life and character. We are confronted, suddenly and dramatically, with fundamental questions about our national community—questions that demand swift and decisive answers.

Are we prepared, after almost 200 years, to abandon our experiment—intermittently successful but always hopeful—in enlightened self-government? Will we permit our highest and most powerful office—an office whose occupant can literally decide the future and even the survival of the nation and the world—to remain in the hands of a man who has, in the words of the American Civil Liberties Union, "made one thing perfectly clear: He will function above the law whenever he can get away with it"? Will we refrain because of our timidity or sheer inertia, from availing ourselves of the remedies provided by the Constitution of the United States for precisely such an emergency?

Three years remain in Richard M. Nixon's second Presidential term—time enough for him to compound and render irreversible the catastrophic damage he has already done. It is understandable that the President may feel that if he can survive in office for those three years, he will have achieved a measure of vindication. But his vindication will be our indictment and conviction. If we, the American people, knowing what we now know about this President and his Administration, permit him to serve out his term, we will stand condemned in history for the grave offense of murdering the American dream.

These pages go to press amidst a chorus of demands for Mr. Nixon's resignation. The demands emanate not only from Mr. Nixon's long-standing critics—his "enemies," as he would doubtless style them—but from many who were, until recently, among his most enthusiastic supporters. The editors of Time, in the first editorial of the magazine's fifty-year history—at least the first so labeled—called on him to "give up the Presidency rather than do further damage to the country." The same suggestion has been advanced by newspapers which, only a little more than a year ago, were unreservedly advocating his re-election and which, only months ago, were minimizing the gravity of the Watergate disclosures; by Republican politicians who fear, not without justification, that the President is now an intolerable burden to their party; by businessmen who no longer can vest their confidence in Mr. Nixon as the chosen instrument of corporate prosperity.

Mr. Nixon would derive some obvious benefits if he were to heed this advice and relinquish his office. Unlike his recently departed Vice President, Spiro T. Agnew, he would not have to couple his resignation with a guilty plea to any crime. Like Mr. Agnew, he could continue to proclaim his innocence—and to denounce his "enemies"—in perpetuity. He has always relished the role of victim, and he could carry it to oblivion.

At the same time, the Congress would be spared from exercising a responsibility which it clearly does not welcome—the responsibility of impeaching the President of the United States. And the American people, the people who only a year ago gave the Presi-

dent an unprecedented mandate and whose disenchantment has now reached unprecedented depths, could breathe a deep sigh and go about the business of restoring a measure of order and hope to their national affairs.

But the decision to resign is, ultimately, the President's alone to make, and the word from the White House at this writing is that he will not be moved (or removed). He has "no intention whatever of walking away from the job I was elected to do," he told the nation on November 7.

It is our judgment, and we believe it is the American people's judgment, that the job he has done is enough. Until and unless the President changes his mind about resigning, the decision to resolve the crisis that grips the nation will be ours to make—for only by exerting immense and unremitting pressure can we convince the Congress that it must discharge its constitutional responsibility. Public opinion has already persuaded some legislators to abandon their customary vacillating stance. Public opinion, forcefully applied, can move the requisite number of Representatives to embark on the process of impeachment.

The first order of business confronting Congress is to fill the vacancy in the Vice Presidency. Mr. Nixon's designee, Representative Gerald R. Ford of Michigan, would hardly be our first (or thousandth) choice; he is, in our view, unsuited intellectually and politically to hold the nation's highest office. But given the choice—and it is the choice we are given—between mediocrity (Mr. Ford) and moral disgrace (Mr. Nixon), we have no difficulty choosing the former. America has muddled through with mediocre leadership before, but it cannot go on much longer with leadership that is morally bankrupt.

Once a Vice President has been installed, the "engine of impeachment"—James Madison's term—can be set in motion. It is an engine that the leaders of the House and Senate clearly would prefer not to start, but it can be ignited by any member of the House of Representatives who chooses to take the floor and declare: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of constitutional privilege. . . . I impeach Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States, for high crimes and misdemeanors." Citing only the facts that have already come to light, that have for the most part been verified, this member of the House can invite his colleagues to do their constitutional duty by considering the charges against the President in

A BILL OF IMPEACHMENT

I. Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States, through his personal acts and those of his appointees and aides, has fostered, tolerated, and attempted to conceal the worst political scandals in this nation's history, thereby paralyzing the Government, inviting the contempt of the American people, and casting discredit on our country and its leadership throughout the world.

II. He is and must be held accountable for the crimes committed by many of his subordinates, for it is his responsibility, as Madison observed, "to superintend their conduct so as to check their excesses." If he was aware of their offenses, he is criminally culpable; if he was unaware, he is criminally inept.

III. He has attained and retained the high office he now holds through the use of illegal means, to wit: His agents have extracted secret and unlawful campaign contributions from various special interests in return for pledges of favorable government action in their behalf; they have authorized and commissioned snoopers and second-story men, styled "plumbers," to burglarize and spy on his political opponents, in violation of the common criminal statutes; they have hired saboteurs to employ various "dirty tricks" to disrupt a political campaign.

IV. He has attempted to undermine, circumvent, or annul the guarantees of the Bill of Rights—particularly the rights to privacy, freedom of speech, and freedom of the press—by: mounting an unprecedented campaign of harassment and vilification against the media of news and information; employing illegal wiretaps to spy on journalists and critics of his Administration; encouraging his aides to devise means of intimidating the media by use of governmental powers; embarking on political trials designed to silence those who dissented from his policies.

V. He has arrogated to himself powers not conferred by the Constitution, or powers expressly reserved to Congress, to wit: He has secretly, illegally, and deceptively ordered the bombing of a nation—Cambodia—without the knowledge or consent of the American people and their elected representatives; he has unlawfully impounded Federal funds totaling many millions of dollars that were duly appropriated by Congress in legislation he himself had signed; he has invoked a nebulous and dubious doctrine of "executive privilege" to withhold from the people information about the people's business.

VI. He has employed fraudulent schemes to muster—or create an appearance of—public support for his Administration's major policies, especially with respect to the unlawful invasion and bombing of Cambodia. These schemes have involved the placement of newspaper advertisements concocted in the White House, the generation of inspired letters and telegrams of support, and the manipulation of public opinion polls.

VII. He and his associates have conspired in sundry schemes to obstruct justice by: attempting to withhold evidence in criminal cases pertaining to the Watergate Affair; dismissing the Special Prosecutor, Archibald Cox; when he proved determined to do his job; tendering bribes to defendants and witnesses to induce them to remain silent or offer perjured testimony; persuading the former director of the FBI to destroy evidence; invoking "non-existing conflicts with CIA operations" to thwart an FBI inquiry; attempting to influence the judge in the Pentagon Papers trial; ordering the Attorney General not to press a series of antitrust actions against the International Telephone and Telegraph Corporation.

VIII. He has subverted the integrity of various Federal agencies by sanctioning efforts to: bring about a reversal of the Agriculture Department's policy on dairy price supports to accommodate major campaign contributors; involve the CIA and the FBI in unlawful operations associated with the operations of the "plumbers;" exert pressure on independent regulatory agencies to hand down decisions favorable to his friends and supporters; employ the Internal Revenue Service to punish his "enemies."

IX. He has conducted his personal affairs in a manner that directly contravenes the traditional Presidential obligation to demonstrate "moral leadership," to wit: He has used substantial amounts of the taxpayers' money to pay for certain improvements and maintenance of his private homes—expenditures that can in no way be related to secu-

rity requirements or any other public purpose; he has taken advantage of every tax loophole permitted by law—and some of doubtful legality—to diminish his own tax obligations; he has entered into questionable arrangements with his friends to acquire large personal property holdings at minimal cost to himself; he has publicly and emphatically defended one of these friends, G. C. (Bebe) Rebozo, at a time when various Federal agencies were conducting supposedly impartial investigations into his financial affairs.

X. He has attempted to deceive the American people with respect to virtually every particular cited in this Bill of Impeachment, by withholding information and evidence; by misstating the facts when they could no longer be totally suppressed; by constantly changing his version of the facts, so that the people could no longer place any credibility whatever in statements emanating from the Chief Executive of their Government, to the point where it now seems doubtful that he would be believed even if he were to begin, miraculously, to tell the truth.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until the hour of 12 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second? [Putting the question.]

There is a sufficient second. The yeas and nays are ordered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion to adjourn. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from Florida (Mr. CHILES), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. McGEE), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL) are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON) is absent because of illness.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), the Senator from Florida (Mr. GURNEY), the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. SAXBE), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT) are necessarily absent.

Also, the Senator from Oregon (Mr.

HATFIELD), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. PEARSON), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT), and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON) is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Idaho (Mr. McCURE) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. PACKWOOD) are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 78, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 547 Leg.]

YEAS—78

Abourezk	Dominick	Mondale
Aiken	Eastland	Montoya
Allen	Ervin	Moss
Bartlett	Fannin	Muskie
Bayh	Fong	Nelson
Beall	Gravel	Nunn
Bellmon	Griffin	Pastore
Bennett	Hansen	Pell
Bentsen	Hart	Proxmire
Bible	Hartke	Ribicoff
Biden	Haskell	Roth
Brock	Hathaway	Schweiker
Brooke	Helms	Scott, Hugh
Buckley	Hollings	Sparkman
Burdick	Hruska	Stafford
Byrd	Huddleston	Stennis
Harry F., Jr.	Humphrey	Stevens
Byrd, Robert C.	Inouye	Stevenson
Cannon	Jackson	Talmadge
Case	Johnston	Thurmond
Church	Kennedy	Tower
Clark	Long	Tunney
Cook	Magnuson	Welcker
Cranston	Mansfield	Williams
Curtis	McGovern	Young
Dole	McIntyre	
Domenici	Metcalf	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—22

Baker	Hughes	Percy
Chiles	Javits	Randolph
Cotton	Mathias	Saxbe
Eagleton	McClellan	Scott,
Fulbright	McClure	William L.
Goldwater	McGee	Symington
Gurney	Packwood	Taft
Hatfield	Pearson	

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. Moss). On this vote there are 78 yeas and 0 nays. The motion to adjourn having been agreed to, the Senate stands in adjournment until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

Thereupon, at 11:58 a.m., the Senate adjourned until Monday, December 3, 1973, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TAX DEDUCTIONS FOR ARTISTS

HON. JOHN BRADEMAs

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, in 1969 Congress passed legislation which effectively eliminated tax deductions which

could be taken by artists and authors for contributions of their original works. This change in the tax law has resulted in the sharp curtailment of contributions of literary and artistic works to museums, libraries, and universities.

Mr. Rubin L. Gorewitz of New York City, in an article in "Art in America," discusses the impact of this tax law change and compares three bills which have been introduced in the House to restore tax deductions for artists. Mr.

Gorewitz observes, by way of illustration, that the 1969 legislation resulted in the loss to the Library of Congress of the collected works of composer Igor Stravinsky, valued at \$3.5 million.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD the text of this article:

ARTISTS/IRS: A MODEST PROPOSAL

(By Rubin L. Gorewitz)

In 1969 Congress passed legislation that has significantly affected artists and art